

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JACK REESE, JAMES  
CICHANOFSKY, ROGER MILLER, and  
GEORGE NOWLIN, on behalf of  
themselves and a similarly situated class,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 04-70592

CNH GLOBAL N.V. and  
CNH AMERICA LLC,

Honorable Patrick J. Duggan

Defendants.

---

**OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART  
PLAINTIFFS' SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING  
ORDER AND FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' second motion for an extension of the current scheduling order which the Court set in a July 30, 2013 opinion and order. (ECF No. 360.) Plaintiffs filed their motion on October 24, 2013, and seek immediate consideration. Defendants filed a response to the motion on October 29, 2013.

The current scheduling order, as amended by Magistrate Judge Komives' September 29, 2013 order, establishes the following deadlines:

8/13/13	Defendants to respond to Plaintiffs' discovery requests
9/27/13	Reports due from Plaintiffs' experts

10/17/13	Reports due from Defendants' experts
11/18/13	Discovery closes & Plaintiffs' rebuttal expert report(s) due
12/3/13	Dispositive motion cut-off
1/3/14	Dispositive motion(s) response(s) due
1/10/14	Dispositive motion(s) reply brief(s) due

(ECF No. 360.) In their pending motion, Plaintiffs ask the Court to extend the dates in the current scheduling order by ninety (90) days. As good cause for their request, Plaintiffs refer to their continued attempts to obtain certain documentation from Defendants (including discovery of information included in Defendants' expert witness reports), the "extreme[] difficult[y]" of scheduling the depositions of the parties' experts prior to the current discovery cutoff, and their counsel's schedule in the upcoming months. Defendants oppose Plaintiffs' request to the extent they seek an extension beyond thirty days.

The Court finds good cause to extend the scheduling order. However, the Court declines to extend the deadlines by the ninety days proposed by Plaintiffs. An extension of sixty days of the remaining dates is more reasonable.

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED**, that Plaintiffs' Second Motion for Extension of Scheduling Order and Request for Immediate Consideration is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART** in that the deadlines set forth above that have not passed are extended by **SIXTY (60) DAYS**.

Dated: October 31, 2013

s/PATRICK J. DUGGAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies to:  
Counsel of Record